

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407  
ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting of the  
Academic Senate  
Tuesday, October 7, 1997  
UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

- I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communication(s) and announcement(s):
  - A. **All electronic mail is being sent to your OpenMail account. If you do not have an OpenMail account, mail will be directed to your UNIX account. However, if you have a UNIX account and an OpenMail account, Academic Senate communications will automatically be sent to your OpenMail account.**
  - B. The Academic Senate is now on the World Wide Web. Information regarding meetings, agenda, minutes, etc. can be viewed at <http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen>.
  - C. Draft copy (6.19.97) of Office Space Allocation Policies and Priorities: (see p. 2).
  - D. Final Report of the Task Force on Distance Education: (see p. 2).
  - E. Merit Pay Task Force to Visit Cal Poly on October 9 (p. 3).
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Provost's Office:
  - D. Statewide senators:
  - E. CFA campus president:
  - F. Staff Council representative:
  - G. ASI representatives:
  - H. IACC representative:
  - I. Athletics Governing Board representative:
  - J. Other:
- IV. Consent agenda:
- V. Business item(s):
  - A. **Resolution on the Cal Poly Performance Salary Step Increase Policy:** (pp. 4-11).
  - B. **Resolution on the Search Process and Qualifications for the New CSU Chancellor:** Executive Committee (pp. 12-13).
  - C. **Resolution on the 1997-1998 Budget:** Hood, Chair of the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee (p. 14).
  - D. **Resolution on Faculty Governance of Mode of Instruction:** Laura Freberg, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 15).
- VI. Discussion item(s):
- VII. Adjournment:

**Draft copy (6.19.97) of Office Space Allocation Policies and Priorities:**

*Senators:* A copy of this three-page document has been included with your agenda as a separate document.

*Executive Committee members and individuals on the Academic Senate distribution list:* A copy of this document was included in your 9.23.97 Executive Committee agenda as pages 53-55.

**Final Report of the Task Force on Distance Education:**

*Senators:* A copy of this fourteen-page document has been included with your agenda as a separate document.

*Executive Committee members and individuals on the Academic Senate distribution list:* A copy of this document was included in your 9.23.97 Executive Committee agenda as pages 56-69.

**For your information:**

**MERIT PAY TASK FORCE TO VISIT  
CAL POLY ON OCTOBER 9**

Members of the Merit Pay Task Force will be on campus, **October 9 from 11am to 1pm in 10 (Agriculture building)-220**, to discuss alternative incentive systems for CSU faculty. The task force is seeking any and all suggestions and ideas about what the ideal merit pay and/or incentive pay plan for the CSU should be.

During the spring plenary session of the CSU Academic Senate, Chancellor Munitz stated he was not wed to the current PSSI system and indeed recognized its many flaws. He went on to state that he would welcome an alternative plan. The Merit Pay Task Force was formed to respond to this opportunity to propose an alternative merit pay/incentive plan. It will be visiting each of the 22 campuses to collect ideas about other viable models of merit/incentive pay.

To view the discussion presently taking place on this matter, you may join the following listserve by sending a message to **majordomo@lists.sdsu.edu**, type **subscribe meritpaytf@lists.sdsu.edu** in the body of the message. No subject line and no signature works best.

If you'd like further information about the Merit Pay Task Force, please contact the Academic Senate office at extension 61258 or [mcamuso@calpoly.edu](mailto:mcamuso@calpoly.edu).

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-\_\_-97/  
RESOLUTION ON  
*CAL POLY PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY***

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached *Cal Poly Performance Salary Step Increase Policy*.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: September 23, 1997

Version: September 10, 1997  
(Highlighted/cross-out changes  
shown on this version were made  
by Bob Brown and Mike Sues  
to the previous Executive Committee  
version of July 16, 1997.)

## CAL POLY PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

### 1.0 Performance Salary Step Increases - General Provisions

- 1.1 Performance Salary Step Increases (PSSIs) recognize outstanding or meritorious performance by Unit 3 employees in each of the following areas: teaching and other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University, students, and community. ~~(CBA Unit 3 — Article 31.18)~~ Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a PSSI on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment. (MOU – see Article 31.14)

- 1.1.1 The following working definitions shall apply:

**Outstanding:** exceptional performance; distinguished; acknowledged as a model of performance.

**Meritorious:** commendable performance; worthy of praise, cooperative and productive work with colleagues.

- 1.2 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance by a Unit 3 employee shall be in the form of a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual. PSSI awards shall consist of from one to five steps on the salary schedule in any single review period. ~~(CBA — Article 31.18)~~ year (MOU – see Article 31.15), or shall be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary) in those cases where the faculty unit employee has reached the top step of her/his rank and shall not exceed 2.4% of the incumbent's annual salary base.
- 1.3 For the purposes of PSSI review and funding targets allocation, ~~athletic coaches~~, counselors, librarians, and UCTE Unit 3 employees shall be combined into a single "unit". The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs shall appoint a review committee consisting of one administrative supervisor from each of the represented areas. ~~(CBA — Article 31.26)~~ considered separate units. Athletic coaches shall be merged with PSSI applicants/nominees of the Physical Education and Kinesiology Department (MOU – see Article 31.23)
- 1.4 The effective date of all PSSIs awarded shall be in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement. July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year that there are negotiated performance Salary Step Increases. (MOU – see Article 31.25)
- 1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the PSSI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI program is eliminated, any funds that have been carried forward shall be used for the professional development opportunities identified in Provision 25.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement ~~(CBA, Unit 3, 1995-1998)~~. MOU.
- 1.6 Each year that the PSSI program is funded, the President shall allot ~~85~~ 80% of the campus funding to the colleges/units based on the number of Full-time Equivalent Unit 3 employees in each College. ~~Deans shall inform all Unit 3 employees within their College as to the total funding available to the College and the specific dollar allocations to each department based on departmental FTEF positions. College Deans shall not retain funding for discretionary use. Funds retained by the President shall be utilized, at the discretion of~~



the President, to ensure that Unit 3 employees have the opportunity to receive PSSI awards based on their outstanding performance, rather than the number of Unit 3 employees within their department/unit. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be notified of the allocation model by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in a timely fashion; college/unit (MOU – see Article 31.29); shall reserve 5% of the campus funding to provide a pool for applicants who are subsequently awarded a PSSI pursuant to an appeal (MOU – see Article 31.39); shall retain 15% of the campus funding to be utilized, at the discretion of the President, to ensure that Unit 3 employees have equal opportunity to receive PSSI awards based on their outstanding performance. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be notified of the allocation model by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in a timely fashion.

- 1.7 At each level of evaluation, applicants shall be informed of their standing and be provided with a summary of the rationale for the recommendation basis of their recommendation.
- 2.0 **Eligibility, Applications, and Nominations**
- 2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible to submit an application for a PSSI award (see Appendix A - Application Form) or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators each year that the PSSI program is funded. (CBA – Article 31.19) (MOU – see Article 31.16)
  - 2.1.1 Applications/nominations for of Department Chairs/Heads, and other equivalent supervisors of Unit 3 employees, who are contractually eligible to apply or be nominated, will be evaluated and recommended by their Dean.
  - 2.1.2 Unit 3 employees who are being evaluated for a PSSI, either through nomination or application, cannot serve on any PSSI related evaluation committee which may evaluate said employee.
- 2.3 All applications/nominations must be submitted using the approved PSSI Application format (CBA – Article 31.19; see Appendix A). The application is limited to 3 pages, however applicants/nominators may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the space provided for any specific section. To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the PSSI application form from <http://www.calpoly.edu/ulib/acadson> or obtain a electronic file from Faculty Affairs office to the Department chair/Head or equivalent supervisor prior to the application closure date, with a copy to the President or her/his designee, and must follow the approved PSSI Application format (MOU – see Article 31.16; see Appendix A). The application is limited to 3 pages, however, applicants/nominators may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the amount of space indicated for a specific section. To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the PSSI application form from the OpenMail Bulletin Area-Forms.
- 2.4 Evidence emphasized in support of an application or nomination will be the period since the employee's last PSSI award or for the 5 year period prior to the current application/nomination applicant/nominee is to be limited to the period since the employee's last PSSI award; the 5 year period prior to the current PSSI evaluation; or the interval since their initial appointment at Cal Poly if less than 5 years.
- 2.5 All applications/nominations and supporting documentation must only be submitted in writing. All forms of electronic, photographic, and other media will be returned to the applicant and will not be considered.
- 3.0 **Departmental Procedures and Criteria**
- 3.1 Procedures and criteria used in evaluating applicants for PSSI awards are to be established by each department/unit and approved by the Dean or appropriate administrator, prior to submission of departmental/unit PSSI recommendations. Criteria used in evaluating applicants/nominees are to be consistent with approved promotion and retention criteria applied in RPT evaluations. (CBA – Article 31. Criteria to be used in evaluating applicants/nominees are to be consistent with approved guidelines applied in RPT evaluations. (MOU – see Article 31.18).
- 3.2 Departments may elect to utilize a College level review board. In such cases, the department/unit would request that the Dean convene an elected College level review committee. The composition of said review



~~committee should be consistent with current RPT regulations, but could include representation from departments/units outside of the College when requested by the department/unit being evaluated~~ Review Board. The composition of the Review Board should be similar to the College Peer Review Committee used in promotion considerations, but could include representation from departments/units outside of the College when requested by the department/unit being evaluated.

The Counselor, Librarian, and UCTE units may elect to request that the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs appoint a Review Board consisting of tenured faculty.

- 3.3 Applicants/nominees are to be evaluated in the following areas: ~~teaching performance and/or other professional performance; professional growth and achievement; and service to the university, students, and community (CBA – Article 31.17).~~ area of teaching, as well as other professional accomplishments and service to the University community. (MOU – see Article 31.14)
- 3.4 Academic departments/units ~~(unless replaced by college level review board)~~ shall constitute the highest level faculty review committee with regard to PSSI applications/nominations ~~and shall submit their recommendations to both the Dean of the College and the President of the University (CBA – Article 31.31).~~ Departmental recommendations shall not exceed the anticipated funding level for the department unless replaced by a Review Board. Following completion of the highest level faculty review committee, all applications/nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College. Departmental PSSI recommendations, including the number of salary steps recommended, shall be forwarded to both the Dean of the College and the President of the University (MOU – see Article 31.21) the total cost of all departmental recommendations shall not exceed the targeted allocation for the department/unit.
- 3.4.1 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their department/unit PSSI committee/Review Board of its ~~as to their recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended, along with a summary of their evaluation.~~ Applicants may forward a one page rebuttal statement to the Dean to be included with their original PSSI application.
- 3.4.2 Applicants who, ~~based on departmental ranking, receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the Dean~~ Applicants/nominees who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted departmental/unit allocation shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the Dean.
- 3.4.3 ~~Applicants/nominees may forward a one page rebuttal, to the departmental or Review Board recommendation, to the Dean within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.~~
- 4.0 **Dean's Administrative Review**
- 4.1 The Dean or appropriate administrator of each College/unit shall receive all PSSI applications and recommendations from each department/unit within the College. After review of the applications/nominations, departmental recommendations, ~~applications/nominations,~~ and consultation with the Department Chairs/Heads ~~each Dean will submit their PSSI recommendations to the President. The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the anticipated dollar allocation to the College~~ the Dean or appropriate administrator will submit her/his PSSI recommendations to the President. The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the target allocation for the College/unit.
- 4.2 Administrative review of counselors shall be the responsibility of the Vice President of Student Affairs or her/his designee; for librarians the Dean of Library Services or her/his designee; and for UCTE the Director of UCTE or her/his designee.
- 4.3 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their Dean, or appropriate administrator, as to her/his recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended.



**4.3.1** Applicants/nominees who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted allocation for the College (or equivalent unit) shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the President.

**4.3.2** Applicants/nominees may forward a one page response, regarding the recommendation of the Dean, or appropriate administrator, to the President within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.

~~4.1.1 Applicants/nominees shall be informed of the Dean's recommendation and the number of steps for which the applicant/nominee was recommended. Furthermore, applicants/nominees shall receive a summary of the Dean's evaluation of their application/nomination. Applicants may forward a one page rebuttal statement to the President to be included with their original PSSI application.~~

~~4.1.2 Applicants/nominees who are recommended by the Dean, but for whom there is insufficient funding shall have their recommendation forwarded to the President on a separate list for consideration by the President.~~

## **5.0 President's Review**

**5.1** The President or designee shall review the applications/nominations, recommendations from the academic departments/units and College Dean, or appropriate administrator, which have been submitted for consideration. The President shall notify all applicants, within 30 academic working days, of the decision to grant or deny a PSSI award for outstanding or meritorious performance, ~~along with a summary of their evaluation.~~ Applicants ~~granted~~ awarded a PSSI shall also be informed of the number of steps to be granted and the effective date of the award.

**5.2** Applicants who are ~~recommended by their Dean and~~ denied a PSSI award by the President shall have the right to request a review of their application by the Peer Review Panel (see Section ~~7.0~~ 7.1 below).

## **6.0 PSSI calendar and timeline**

**6.1** The specific timeline covering notification, application, evaluation, ~~and Presidential awards~~ and PSSI award announcements shall be established by the Academic Senate each year that the PSSI program is funded by the CSU system by the President in consultation with the Academic Senate.

~~6.1.1 Notification of all Unit 3 employees should occur within 30 days of the campus receiving notification of the funding approval.~~

~~6.1.2 Application/nomination closure date shall be the end of the 4th week of the quarter in which the departmental review will take place.~~

~~6.1.3 Department evaluations shall conclude and all recommendations shall be forwarded to the applicants, Dean, and President by the end of the 8th week of the quarter in which the departmental evaluation takes place. While the notification of the applicants must contain their specific recommendation, including number of steps for which they were recommended, each department/unit shall determine the extent of the information contained within the notification to the applicant (see section 3.1 above)~~

~~6.1.4 The recommendations of the Dean shall be submitted to the President within 15 academic working days of the notification of the departmental recommendations.~~

~~6.1.5 The President shall notify all applicants, within 30 academic working days of receiving the college/unit recommendations, of the decision to grant or deny a PSSI award for outstanding or meritorious performance.~~

## **7.0 Peer Review of PSSI denials**



- 7.1 Applicants/nominees who have received a favorable recommendation from their department or college/unit PSSI committee and who subsequently fail to receive a PSSI award shall be eligible to have their application reviewed by the University Peer Review Panel. The appeal letter, addressed to the Provost, will be a maximum of six pages may be up to six pages in length double-spaced, and must be received by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within ten academic working days of the notification of denial receipt of the notification of denial. (MOU – see Article 31.40)
- 7.2 University Peer Review Panels, consisting of 3 members and 1 alternate, will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate California Faculty Association members shall be selected by lot from among all full-time tenured faculty who did not serve on a PSSI committee, and who were not applicants/nominees for a PSSI award. (MOU – see Articles 31.41; 31.42)
- 7.3 The University Peer Panel shall begin to review the specific Performance Salary Step denial within 14 days of its selection by lot. The Panel's review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the increase denial of the applicant/nominee, and the employer's appropriate administrator's written response to any allegations made by the affected employee. Except for presentations of the complainant and the administrator, if the administrator chooses, the peer review will be made from the documents set forth in Section 32.39 31.43 of the MOU.

The proceeding above will not be open to the public and shall not be a hearing, per MOU 31.40.

~~No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the University Peer Panel shall submit to the President and the complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the University Peer Panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the Panel has complied with Section 31.41 of the MOU, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case.~~

- 7.4 ~~The President shall consider the University Peer Review Panel's recommendations and all forwarded materials and, no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the University Peer Review Panel's report, notify the affected employee and the University Peer Review Panel of her/his final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification to the employee of the President's decision concludes the peer review procedure and such decision shall not be reviewable in any forum.~~
- 7.4 The University Peer Review Panel proceeding will not be open to the public and shall not constitute a hearing. (MOU – see Article 31.44)
- 7.5 No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the University peer Review Panel shall submit to the President and complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the University Peer Review Panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the panel has complied with this section, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case. (MOU – see Article 31.45)
- 7.6 The President shall consider the University Peer Review Panel's recommendations and all forwarded materials. No later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the University Peer Review Panel's report, the President shall notify the applicant/nominee and the University peer Review panel of her/his final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification of the President's decision concludes the peer review procedure and her/his decision shall not be subject to review in any forum.

## **Proposed 1997-98 PSSI Schedule**

### **September 15 to October 31 (7 weeks)**

- Departments develop criteria and procedures to be used in evaluating PSSI applicants.
- Departmental PSSI criteria to be submitted to the dean/appropriate administrator for approval by Oct 31, 1997

### **Oct 31 - November 21 (3 weeks)**

- Dean's review and approval of department PSSI criteria.

### **Nov 21 - January 9 (6 weeks)**

- PSSI applications due to the Department Chair/Head

### **Jan 9 - February 6 (4 weeks)**

- Department review of applicants.
- Department recommendations submitted to the President, dean/appropriate administrator, and applicants by Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>.

### **Feb 6 - Feb 27 (3 weeks)**

- Review of PSSI materials by the Dean
- Dean's recommendations submitted to the President and applicants by Feb 27

### **Feb 27- April 3 (5 weeks)**

- Review of PSSI materials and recommendations by the President or PSSI designee
- President notifies applicants of his decision by April 3<sup>rd</sup>.

### **April 3 - April 17 (2 weeks)**

- Peer Review requests due to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs by April 17<sup>th</sup>.

### **April 24 (1 week)**

- Review Panel formed.

### **April 24 - June 5 (6 weeks)**

- Review Panel report submitted to the President by June 5<sup>th</sup>.

### **June 19 (2 weeks)**

- Applicants notified of the President's decision.



## SAMPLE PSSI APPLICATION

Name of Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Last PSSI Award  
and Number of Steps: \_\_\_\_\_

### **TEACHING PERFORMANCE:** (limited to one page)

Applicants are encouraged to include discussion of their teaching philosophy and methods, contributions to curricular development, and efforts to implement innovative instruction.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

### **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:** (limited to one page)

Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of professional development. Applicants should include discussion of how their professional activities relate to their teaching function and the mission of the university.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

### **SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY:** (limited to one page)

Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of service to the university community. Applicants should address how their service enhances and promotes the mission of the university.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-\_\_-97/  
RESOLUTION ON  
SEARCH PROCESS AND QUALIFICATIONS  
FOR NEW CSU CHANCELLOR**

- WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has determined that the current CSU Chancellor Search Committee will not include a faculty member except the Faculty Trustee; and
- WHEREAS, The elimination of faculty representative on the search committee is contrary to prior practice and breaches the CSU Statement of Collegiality which acknowledges and respects the faculty's role in the shared governance of the University; and
- WHEREAS, The Chancellor of the CSU is the academic leader of this institution, and faculty are significantly affected by this leadership; and
- WHEREAS, Faculty have the professional responsibility to execute the CSU's primary mission of education and should therefore participate directly in the search for its academic leader; and
- WHEREAS, Direct faculty participation in the search process will enhance the credibility of the new Chancellor selection both within and outside the CSU system; and
- WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has recognized the importance of its search for a new Chancellor and has requested written input on the qualifications for the position; and
- WHEREAS, The chief academic and chief executive officer of the CSU system should demonstrate experience in the academy through teaching and scholarship as well as administrative experience in complex organizations; and
- WHEREAS, The position description for the new Chancellor no longer emphasizes these academic qualifications but refers only to the candidate's "commitment to higher education and the values of an academic community" and "demonstrated commitment to quality education"; and
- WHEREAS, This recent change in the job description for the next Chancellor has given the impression that this leader need not be well acquainted with the culture of higher education;
- WHEREAS, These developments may have the unfortunate effect of undermining the cooperation and trust between faculty and CSU administration and could also undermine the confidence of the faculty in its next academic leader; therefore, be it



- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University urge the CSU Board of Trustees to permit CSU faculty to participate directly and meaningfully in the Chancellor search process through faculty representation on the search committee; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University urge in the strongest possible terms that the CSU Board of Trustees revise its job description for CSU Chancellor to include the requirement that the candidate have a record in teaching, scholarship, and academic administration; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That pursuant to the CSU Board of Trustees request for written input from faculty on the qualifications for the next Chancellor, that copies of this resolution be distributed to each member of the Board and to the Academic Senate CSU.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Executive  
Committee

Date: September 23, 1997

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-\_\_-97/  
RESOLUTION ON  
THE 1997-1998 BUDGET**

- WHEREAS,     *The Draft Budget Planning Concept Statement for the 1997-1999 Time Frame of Cal Poly* emphasizes the education of its students and the pursuit of academic endeavors; and
- WHEREAS,     Cal Poly maintains its national and statewide reputation by virtue of its academic achievement and the success of its graduates; and
- WHEREAS,     The amount of funds available for the 1997-1998 year will require that the budget allocations be very judiciously scrutinized in order to meet the academic demands of the enrolled students of Cal Poly; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED:   That support for academic programs should be given the highest priority in the upcoming budget considerations.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Budget and  
Long-Range Planning Committee  
Date: September 23, 1997



Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-\_\_-97/  
RESOLUTION ON  
FACULTY GOVERNANCE OF MODE OF INSTRUCTION**

- WHEREAS, Curriculum development and oversight are among the most important responsibilities of the faculty; and
- WHEREAS, The curriculum process is best served when a climate of full disclosure and consultation is encouraged; and
- WHEREAS, The use of distributed and distance learning techniques is becoming much more frequent; and
- WHEREAS, The use of distributed and distance learning techniques represents a significant and relatively experimental change in instructional mode; and
- WHEREAS, There is currently no mechanism of university-wide faculty review for the use of distributed and distance learning; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That new course proposals should specify whether or not distance and distributed learning techniques will be used, to what degree they will be used, and a rationale for how these techniques will contribute to positive student outcomes; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That existing courses undergoing a change in mode of instruction from traditional to distributed or distance learning be reviewed under current policies and procedures for new courses; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Instruction and Curriculum Committees provide an annual report to the full Senate regarding the use of distributed and distance learning on campus.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Instruction  
Committee  
Date: September 23, 1997

Shin - Senate 10.7.97

Revised  
Resolution on Future Cal Poly Budgets

- WHEREAS The Cal Poly Mission Statement, Cal Poly's Strategic Plan and the Cal Poly Plan all emphasize the education of its students and the pursuit of academic excellence; and
- WHEREAS Cal Poly maintains its national and statewide reputation by virtue of the teaching and academic achievements of its faculty and the success of its graduates; and
- WHEREAS The projected availability of state funds for the CSU system in the coming years will require that budget allocations for Cal Poly be very judiciously scrutinized in to order to meet the academic demands of the students enrolled here; therefore be it
- RESOLVED That support for academic programs should be given the highest priority in future Cal Poly budgets.



Sims - Senate 10.7.97

CETI - Campus Consultation  
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo  
Proposed Feedback for CTI and the Chancellor

DRAFT

*This summarizes the key points we wish to share with the Chancellor relative to the CETI partnership proposal and the current development/negotiation process to produce an agreement in support of the Telecommunications Infrastructure Initiative (TII). This preliminary draft is based primarily on the consultative sessions held on 9/30 at Cal Poly and will, in its final format, be included in a letter to the Commission on Telecommunications Infrastructure (CTI) as well as the Chancellor.*

The two guiding questions we have been asked to address are "What constitutes the 'ideal' deal with our TII partners?" and "What are the issues of concern on our campus that need to be considered in the negotiations?" Here at Cal Poly, we augmented these questions during the campus reviews by adding the informational aspect, i.e. "What facts and information, issues and concerns do we need to know more about in order to assess the impact on our campus?"

The "ideal deal" theme will be addressed in the actual transmittal letter. The issues and concerns will be summarized here. This is in part due to the fact that most of those who were able to provide suggestions feel there are currently a significant number of open and unanswered questions, many of which prevent a full understanding of the actual "deal". We truly need to get clarity on these issues and, in one sense, these issues, questions and concerns become the requirements as we see them of a successful partnership.

The broad rationale for an infrastructure initiative is not controversial, nor is the need to fund and develop an effective means to deliver at both the campus and CSU system level the necessary access and requisite bandwidth, training and support.

What is in question is will this "deal" have the correct priorities, and safeguards to protect the core mission of the CSU and Cal Poly? And, in this context, will the financing, revenue sources and governance structure that are created to build out and sustain the infrastructure be worth the risks, or price, to us as an educational institution? If, for example, future events present choices that endanger the economic viability of the CETI partnership how will the educational mission be preserved and not compromised to meet the financial and "business" priorities of the CETI team?

What has emerged, thus far, is a fairly clear grasp by the faculty, staff and others of the reasons why such a partnership *could be* beneficial as an enabler or means to several important teaching and learning ends. The potential impact on the core mission and the culture of the institution, however, is of real concern. Therefore, what has accompanied Cal Poly's interest in fully evaluating the benefits of this proposal is a rather specific call for clarifications and assurances that outcomes and potentially unforeseen adverse consequences and expectations are provided for and "nailed down" as the partnership is developed and before it is concluded.

Based on our campus consultations, six categories of issues have emerged and are listed below. Each section includes our preliminary "expectations" of what we might term "critical success factors," and in some cases we have identified issues which might actually approach the level of "deal killers".

- **Precision of Both Scope and Baseline** The Information Technology Strategy (ITS) described, and we understand, the "baseline" characteristics of this project. What is actually in the CETI baseline build-out as it is now constituted and how will the level of delivered functionality be measured, maintained and grown over time? How will the "baseline" change as speed, usage and connectivity is improved? How will a degree of incentive and equity be achieved for those campuses that are currently in an advanced stage of their present infrastructure build-out? Clarity as to scope itself is also needed. Scope ties both to what the build-out is for in terms of services and functionality, and also appears to potentially encompass a range of revenue producing ideas, many of which are not confined in any prior sense to the infrastructure focus. Here we feel that considerable additional precision is needed to alleviate concerns about the range and extent that this project might become



CETI - Campus Consultation  
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo  
Proposed Feedback for CTI and the Chancellor

too invasive in the teaching and learning mission of the University. Our own ITS staff can envision access to important resources that can increase their capabilities to deliver vital services. Here, too, precision as to how the "sub-contracting" relationship will exist and what personal and career opportunities this partnership will bring to our IT personnel must be quickly described and clarified. This issue also impacts on how well stakeholders, particularly students and faculty, feel they can identify with the reasons and benefits for doing this as opposed to the threats and uncertainties associated with the broader and cultural issues that tie to teaching and learning, fees, etc.

- **The Processes of Governance** Decisions about equity (of existing investments) and priorities for each campus's current investments and planned programs for both the three-year build-out and refresh plans need to be more specific. The emphasis needs to be on the processes for how and how much of our present campus IT budgets and their components will be shifted and potentially re-directed to CETI and with what level of influence and determination by each campus. How will the absolute and relative competencies and service levels of IT on each campus be sustained and improved for our students, staff and faculty, and how will existing collective bargaining and intellectual property agreements be incorporated into the partnership agreements?
- **The Enabling Political, Regulatory and Financial Framework and Legal Instruments** There is wide acceptance that the partnership needs a fairly explicit and detailed description of the means and framework by which this legal entity will be formed and by which it might also be dissolved. Consideration needs to be given to enlisting specialized "outside" legal counsel where the complex, corporate aspects of the partnership are at stake. Reasons include the need to effectively attract financing from capital markets, minimize political risk, and stipulate what governmental and political role the State of California will play in funding and sustaining current spending levels for IT operations for the CSU from State revenues. Such instruments should also stipulate CETI's intent in preserving the rights and agreements the CSU has with its current employees through contracts and collective bargaining, and in supporting or promoting the results of CETI's investments in core infrastructure and revenue development activities. Issues such as potential tax incentives, legislation to enable this partnership to operate as a public-private "authority" (or in some other innovative model?), and Sacramento's overall intentions to assist in the creation of this partnership should also be described. It has also been pointed out that there is a range of existing public law; e.g. Title V, HEERA, FERPA, etc. which may possibly impact on the ability of the CETI team to form a "going concern". It is in the interests of all parties that an assessment of such impacts is fully provided for in the structuring of the business and operational plans.
- **Specify and Clarify the Business Model** The "soundness and saneness" of the business model is not clear. This raises concern about what appears to be excessive emphasis on the "Flagship Fifty" for new means to fund the payment stream of the venture itself (\$2billion+). This in turn raises questions about how the teaching and learning priorities can be preserved and not put at risk if projected revenue streams are not forthcoming. The projected refresh rate for the infrastructure and desktop, at a minimum of \$10 million per year, does not appear to be adequate and can potentially create additional pressure on the business case. In CETI there are three "sources" of funds: efficiencies drawn from present expenditures on IT per campus; new revenues derived from the delivery of core operations and new IT services, and new revenues drawn from collaborations formed within the CETI partnership and with new markets/customers. How will each campus be asked to participate in generating their relative contribution to the overall build-out and costs? What incentives will be available to the campuses that are currently achieving significant productivity or service levels or who are presently generating revenues that supplement operating budgets or off-set special build-out costs (e.g., paid modem pools, "delta funds", etc.)? How will those campuses that are not able to achieve adequate "internal" sources of funds afford to keep current, and how will those presently achieving adequate infrastructure programs, or who have achieved success in "new" revenue developments, be able to sustain or advance their current momentum? What role will campus auxiliaries play in participating in the CETI partnership?



CETI - Campus Consultation  
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo  
Proposed Feedback for CTI and the Chancellor

- **Academic and Student Benefits and Independence** Our campus sees real value in spelling out the benefits that will be derived from this partnership for academic programs, faculty and staff and for students. In doing this, the emphasis needs to be on how faculty and students will have access to IT resources that encourage the advancement of their discipline specific programs and learning and which are not strictly driven by "standards". At the "desktop" and in the classroom, there is a concern that such "standardization" could conflict with their continuing needs for innovation and collaboration. This is a particular concern in the use of new and different discipline-specific IT platforms and software. We should also address how the prescribed CETI platform will impact on established relationships with other existing suppliers, and with research collaborators and impacted major corporate donors who are not currently in the CETI commercial team. The specific role Microsoft will play in determining the level of choice and "standardization" available to faculty and students within the partnership is a major concern. In fact, depending on how Microsoft's role is described and limited, it could have a profound effect on the faculty's interests in supporting the overall proposal. We also believe that a shared governance model must be developed to facilitate the effective application of the intellectual property developed by the faculty, students and staff, and that the development of this intellectual property must be consistent with existing IP policies. Subjects like "work for hire" principles, the production of targeted "courseware", and the means and extent that faculty will be compensated and benefit from CETI's interests in marketing educational content must be described and illustrated during the consultative phase and before a final agreement is concluded.
- **The Risk of Commercialization** There is both economic and institutional value in the CSU and the individual campus's reputation in higher education at the national level and on a global basis. In a sense this represents our "brand" and has won the respect and recognition of the public. It is both a value and an asset. Care must be taken to preserve the value of this reputation and not endanger it as we build the portfolio of services and "products" that the CETI partnership intends to offer. A stakeholder review process that seeks to achieve balance and perspective on the use of CSU's brand and the protection of our academic reputation is recommended. In addition, the opportunities offered to increase and expand faculty and student services must not be excessively or inappropriately commercialized. A number of the "Flagship Fifty" services / revenue opportunities seem to depend on levels of "exclusivity" of access to CSU students, faculty, and staff that should not be based strictly on revenue dependencies. The value and range of services delivered must be available on a truly competitive basis, and must stand market tests to insure fairness and choice, a test that we would expect for all our stakeholders. Finally, when evaluating potential revenue sources, outside of the core base of IT services, the anticipated new services offered must be scrutinized to insure that the services themselves do not displace those currently delivered by our existing staff (e.g. Student Affairs, Alumni Services, etc.) and faculty. Where new delivery options are determined to be possible, the choice and discretion for delivery should remain within the CSU's own prerogatives.



## CAL POLY PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

### 1.0 Performance Salary Step Increases - General Provisions

1.1 Performance Salary Step Increases (PSSI) recognize outstanding or meritorious performance in each of the following the areas: teaching and other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University community, students, and community. Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a PSSI on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment (MOU -- see Article 31.14).

1.1.1 The following working definitions shall apply:

**Outstanding:** exceptional performance; distinguished; acknowledged as a model of performance.

**Meritorious:** commendable performance; worthy of praise, cooperative and productive work with colleagues.

- 1.2 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance by a Unit 3 employee shall be in the form of a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual. PSSI awards shall consist of from one to five steps on the salary schedule in any single year (MOU -- see Article 31.15), or shall be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary) in those cases where the faculty unit employee has reached the top step of his/her rank and shall not exceed 2.4% of the incumbent's annual salary base.
- 1.3 For the purposes of PSSI review and funding targets, counselors, librarians, and UCTE Unit 3 employees shall be considered separate units. Athletic coaches shall be merged with PSSI applicants/nominees of the Physical Education and Kinesiology Department (MOU -- see Article 31.23).
- 1.4 The effective date of all PSSI awards shall be July 1st of each year that there are negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases (MOU -- see Article 31.25).
- 1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the PSSI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI program is eliminated, any funds that have been carried forward shall be used for the professional development opportunities identified in Provision 25.1 of the MOU.
- 1.6 Each year that the PSSI program is funded, the President shall allot 80% of the campus funding to the colleges/units based on the number of Full-time Equivalent Unit 3 employees in each college/unit (MOU -- see Article 31.29); shall reserve 5% of the campus funding to provide a pool for applicants who are subsequently awarded a PSSI pursuant to an appeal (MOU -- see Article 31.39); shall retain 15% of the campus funding to be utilized, at the discretion of the President, to ensure that Unit 3 employees have equal opportunity to receive PSSI awards based on their outstanding performance. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be notified of the allocation model by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs in a timely fashion.
- College Deans shall inform all Unit 3 employees within their College as to the total funding for the College and the amount targeted to each department. College Deans shall not retain funding for discretionary use.
- 1.7 At each level of evaluation, applicants shall be informed of their standing and be provided with a summary of the basis of their recommendation.



## 2.0 Eligibility, Applications, and Nominations

- 2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible to submit an application for a PSSI award or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators each year that the PSSI program is funded (MOU --see Article 31.16).
- 2.1.1 Applications/nominations of Department Chairs/Heads, and other equivalent supervisors of Unit 3 employees, who are contractually eligible to apply or be nominated, will be evaluated and recommended by their Dean.
- 2.1.2 Unit 3 employees who are being evaluated for a PSSI, either through application or nomination, cannot serve on any PSSI related evaluation committee which may evaluate said employee.
- 2.2 All applications/nominations must be submitted to the Department Chair/Head or equivalent supervisor prior to the application closure date, with a copy to the President or his/her designee, and must follow the approved PSSI Application format (MOU -- see Article 31.16; see page 6). The application is limited to 3 pages, however, applicants/nominators may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the amount of space dedicated to a specific section. To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the PSSI application form from the OpenMail Bulletin Area-Forms.
- 2.3 Evidence submitted in support of an applicant/nominee should emphasize the period since the employee's last PSSI award; the 5 year period prior to the current PSSI evaluation; or the interval since their initial appointment at Cal Poly if less than 5 years.
- 2.4 All applications/nominations and supporting documentation must only be submitted in writing. All forms of electronic, photographic, and other media will be returned to the applicant and will not be considered.

## 3.0 Department Procedures and Criteria

- 3.1 Criteria and procedures used in evaluating applicants for PSSI awards are to be established by each department/unit and approved by the Dean (or appropriate administrator). Criteria to be used in evaluating applicants/nominees are to be consistent with approved guidelines applied in RPT evaluations (MOU -- see Article 31.18).
- 3.2 Departments/units may elect to utilize a College level review board. In such cases, the department/unit would request that the Dean convene an elected Review Board. The composition of the Review Board should be similar to the College Peer Review Committee used in promotion considerations, but could include representation from departments/units outside of the College when requested by the department/unit being evaluated.
- The counselor, librarian, and UCTE units may elect to request that the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs appoint a Review Board consisting of tenured faculty.
- 3.3 Applicants/nominees are to be evaluated in the following areas: teaching performance and/or other professional performance; professional growth and achievement; and service to the university, students, and community (MOU --see Article 31.14).
- 3.4 Academic departments/units shall constitute the highest level faculty review committee with regard to PSSI applications/nominations unless replaced by a Review Board. Following completion of the evaluation procedure used by the faculty review committee, all applications/nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College (or appropriate administrator). Departmental PSSI recommendations, including the number of salary steps recommended, shall be forwarded to both the Dean of the College (or appropriate administrator) and the President of the University (MOU --See Article 31.21).



3.4.1 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their department/unit PSSI committee/Review Board of its recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended.

3.4.2 Applicants/nominees may forward a one page rebuttal, to the departmental or Review Board recommendation, to the Dean or appropriate administrator within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.

3.5 The total cost of all departmental recommendations shall not exceed the targeted allocation for the department/unit.

3.5.1 Applicants/nominees who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted departmental/unit allocation shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the Dean.

#### 4.0 Administrative Review

4.1 The Dean or appropriate administrator of each College/unit shall receive all PSSI applications and recommendations from each department/unit within the College. After review of the applications/nominations, departmental recommendations, and consultation with the Department Chairs/Heads, the Dean or appropriate administrator will submit his/her PSSI recommendations to the President. The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the target allocation for the College/unit.

4.2 Administrative review of counselors shall be the responsibility of the Vice President of Student Affairs or his/her designee; for librarians the Dean of Library Services or his/her designee; and for UCTE the Director of UCTE or his/her designee.

4.3 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their Dean or appropriate administrator as to his/her recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended.

4.3.1 Applicants/nominees who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted allocation for the College (or equivalent unit) shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the President.

4.3.2 Applicants/nominees may forward a one page response, regarding the recommendation of the Dean (or appropriate administrator), to the President within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.

#### 5.0 President's Review

5.1 The President or designee shall review the applications/nominations, recommendations from the academic departments/units and College Deans, or appropriate administrator, which have been submitted for consideration. The President shall notify all applicants, within 30 academic working days, of the decision to grant or deny a PSSI award for outstanding or meritorious performance. Applicants awarded a PSSI shall also be informed of the number of steps to be granted and the effective date of the award.

5.2 Applicants who are denied a PSSI award shall have the right to request a review of their application by the Peer Review Panel (see Section 7.1 below).

#### 6.0 PSSI calendar and timeline

6.1 The specific timeline covering notification, application, evaluation, and PSSI award announcements shall be established by the President in consultation with the Academic Senate.



## **7.0 Peer Review of PSSI denials**

- 7.1** Applicants/nominees who fail to receive a PSSI award shall be eligible to have their application reviewed by the University Peer Review Panel. The appeal letter may be up to six pages in length, double spaced, and must be received by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs within ten academic working days of receipt of the notification of denial (MOU --See Article 31.40).
- 7.2** University Peer Review Panels, consisting of 3 members and 1 alternate, will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs in consultation with California Faculty Association. Members shall be selected by lot from among all full-time, tenured faculty who did not serve on a PSSI committee, and who were not applicants/nominees for a PSSI award (MOU --See Articles 31.41; 31.42).
- 7.3** The University Peer Review Panel shall begin to review the specific Performance Salary Step denial within 14 days of its selection. The Panel's review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the increase denial of the applicant/nominee, and the appropriate administrator's written response to any allegations made by the affected employee. Except for presentations of the complainant and the administrator, if the administrator chooses, the peer review will be made from the documents set forth in Section 31.43 of the MOU.
- 7.4** The University Peer Review Panel proceeding will not be open to the public and shall not constitute a hearing (MOU --See Article 31.44).
- 7.5** No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the University Peer Review Panel shall submit to the President and complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the University Peer Review panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the panel has complied with this section, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case (MOU --See Article 31.45).
- 7.6** The President shall consider the University Peer Review Panel's recommendations and all forwarded materials. No later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the University Peer Review Panel's report, the President shall notify the applicant/nominee and the University Peer Review Panel of his/her final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification of the President's decision concludes the peer review procedure and his/her decision shall not be subject to review in any forum.

## 1997-98 PSSI Schedule

### September 15 to October 31 (~7 weeks)

- Departments develop criteria and procedures to be used in evaluating PSSI applicants.
- Departmental PSSI criteria to be submitted to the Dean for approval by Oct 31, 1997

### Oct 31 - November 21 (3 weeks)

- Dean/appropriate administrator review and approval of department PSSI criteria.

### Nov 21 - January 9 (6 weeks)

- PSSI applications due to the Department Chair/Head

### Jan 9 - February 6 (4 weeks)

- Department review of applicants.
- Department recommendations submitted to the President, Dean, and applicants by Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>.

### Feb 6 – Feb 27 (3 weeks)

- Review of PSSI materials by the Dean
- Dean/appropriate administrator recommendations submitted to the President and applicants by Feb 27.

### Feb 27- April 3 (5 weeks)

- Review of PSSI materials and recommendations by the President or his designee
- President notifies applicants of PSSI decision by April 3<sup>rd</sup>.

### April 3 - April 17 (2 weeks)

- Peer Review requests due to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs by April 17<sup>th</sup>.

### April 24 (1 week)

- Review Panel formed.

### April 24 - June 5 (6 weeks)

- Review Panel report submitted to the President by June 5<sup>th</sup>.

### June 19 (2 weeks)

- Applicants notified of the President's decision.



# SAMPLE PSSI APPLICATION

*Instructions: Please complete your application for a PSSI award and submit the completed application and a current resume to your department Chair/Head or equivalent Supervisor prior to January 9, 1998. Your application is limited to 3 pages. Applicants should determine the amount of space dedicated to each of the three areas (Teaching Performance, Professional Growth, and Service to the University), but should not alter the order of these sections. Your current resume and student evaluation summaries are not included within the 3 page limit.*

Name of Applicant : \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Unit : \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Last PSSI : \_\_\_\_\_ Steps \_\_\_\_\_

**TEACHING PERFORMANCE :** Applicants are encouraged to include discussion of their teaching philosophy and methods, contributions to curricular development, and efforts to implement innovative instruction.

(Actual length used to be determined by the applicant)

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT :** Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of professional development. Applicants should include discussion of how their professional activities relate to their teaching function and the mission of the university.

(Actual space used to be determined by the applicant)

**SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS, AND COMMUNITY:** Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of service to the University, students, and community. Applicants should include discussion of how their service activities relate to their teaching function and the mission of the university.

(Actual space used to be determined by the applicant)